

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
9

10 BOOMJ.COM, *et al.*,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 GEORGE PURSEGLOVE, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.  
15

Case No. 2:08-CV-00496-KJD-LRL

**ORDER**

16 Presently before the Court is Defendant/Counterclaimant George Purselove's Motion to  
17 Discharge Writ of Garnishment (#174). Hutchison & Steffen ("H&S") filed a response in opposition  
18 (#180) to which Purselove replied (#181).

19 **I. Analysis**

20 Hutchison & Steffen's Writ of Garnishment is based on a judgment for attorney's fees (#37)  
21 entered in this action on February 10, 2009. Hutchison & Steffen filed its motion to withdraw as  
22 counsel for George Purselove on September 28, 2008. It also filed its motion for fees and costs on  
23 the same date. The order granting the motion to withdraw was entered on October 28, 2008 (#33).  
24 H&S's motion for fees and costs was unopposed and George Purselove was unrepresented by  
25 counsel when the judgment was granted on February 10, 2009. Purselove's present counsel entered  
26 his appearance on April 21, 2009.

1 On September 24, 2009, the Nevada Supreme Court rejected the holding and reasoning of the  
 2 case, Gordon v. Stewart, 324 P.2d 234 (Nev. 1958), relied upon by H&S when it moved for entry of  
 3 judgment for its attorneys fees and costs. Argentena Consol. Mining Co. v. Jolley Urga Wirth  
 4 Woodbury & Standish, 216 P.3d 779, 786 (Nev. 2009)(“we reject...Gordon to the extent [that  
 5 opinion] indicate[s] that the district court has the power to resolve a fee dispute in the underlying  
 6 action irrespective of whether the attorney sought adjudication of a lien). Instead, Argentena  
 7 concluded “that in the absence of an enforceable charging lien, a client’s request to extinguish a  
 8 retaining lien, or the client’s consent to the district court’s adjudication of a retaining lien, the district  
 9 court lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate the attorney-client fee dispute[.]” Id. at 788.

10 H&S did not have an enforceable charging lien because there was no judgment or settlement  
 11 that could be enforced under NRS 18.015 until July 28, 2011. Nor did Purseglove request  
 12 extinguishment of a retaining lien or consent to the adjudication of a retaining lien. Therefore, the  
 13 Court was without authority when it entered the Judgment (#37) on February 10, 2009. Since the  
 14 Court lacked authority, the Judgment (#37) is vacated and the Clerk of the Court will strike it. In the  
 15 absence of a valid judgment, the Court must grant Purseglove’s motion to discharge the writ of  
 16 garnishment.<sup>1</sup>

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24

---

25 <sup>1</sup> The Court recognizes that it has authority under NRS 18.015 to adjudicate the rights of attorneys, clients and  
 26 other parties and enforce a lien upon motion of an attorney having a lien under this section. Argentena also makes clear  
 that an attorney may seek adjudication of a fee dispute against a former client in a separate proceeding. Id. at 787.


1 II. Conclusion

2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Judgment (#37) is **VACATED**;

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court **STRIKE** the Judgment (#37);

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant/Counterclaimant George Purseglove's Motion  
5 to Discharge Writ of Garnishment (#174) is **GRANTED**.

6 DATED this 12<sup>TH</sup> day of January 2012.

7  
8 

9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 Kent J. Dawson  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26